

REMARKS

At the outset, the Examiner is thanked for the thorough review and consideration of the pending application. The Office Action dated June 20, 2008 has been received and its contents carefully reviewed.

By this Amendment, Applicants amend claim 12 and cancel claims 13-14 and 26-33 without prejudice or disclaimer. Accordingly, claims 12 and 15-25 are currently pending, and claims 1-11 and 34-40 are withdrawn as the result of an earlier restriction requirement. Reexamination and reconsideration of the pending claims is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claims 12-33 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 10-16 of copending U.S. Patent Application No. 10/699,854. Claims 12-15 and 26-30 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 10-16 of copending U.S. Patent Application No. 10/717,717 in view of ASA. Applicants respectfully submit that in view of the amendments in claim 12 and cancellations of claims 13-14 and 26-33, the provisional double patenting rejections are believed to be moot. Withdrawal of the rejections is requested.

In the Office Action, claims 26-33 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by the admitted state of the art as taught by applicants disclosure (hereinafter, "ASA"). Claims 12-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over ASA in view of Japanese Patent Publication No. JP05-345,160 (hereinafter, "JP'160").

The rejection of claims 26-33 as being anticipated by ASA is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested. Since the rejected claims 26-33 are cancelled, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of claims 26-33.

The rejection of claims 12-25 as being unpatentable over ASA in view of JP'160 is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Claim 12 is allowable over the cited references in that claim 10 recites a combination of elements including, for example, "dispensing sealant on the alignment plate using a first syringe to form a second alignment mark on the alignment plate; detecting the image of the second

alignment mark in a first display unit using a first image camera; moving the table along at least one of X- and Y-directions to align the image of the second alignment mark with a first reference position using the first display unit; detecting the image of the first alignment mark in a second display unit using a second image camera; and moving the second image camera along at least one of X- and Y-directions to align the image of the first alignment mark with a second reference position using the second display unit.” None of the cited references, singly or in combination, teaches or suggests at least this feature of the claimed invention.

In rejecting claim 12, the Examiner acknowledges that ASA “does not explicitly teach that the aligning substrate is attached to a side of the table.” See Office Action, lines 16-17 page 5. The Examiner cites JP’160 as allegedly teaching “a method of aligning a dispenser to forming a sealant layer on a LCD substrate. An aligning substrate 6 is used to achieve proper nozzle alignment. The nozzle can contact the aligning substrate while the LCD substrate is located on the table” and thus JP’160 reasonably teaching “the use of a fixed aligning substrate that is not required to be loaded/unloaded on the table.” As motivation for modifying the teachings of ASA with JP’160, the Examiner states, “It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have provided a fixed aligning substrate in the method of ASA with a reasonable expectation of success because JP’160 teach that such a method of aligning is operable in the LCD deposition art.”

Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner’s statement. As shown Fig. 4 of JP’160, the nozzle (1) is position over a rod cell (6) disposed at the side of the substrate (2). In JP’160, the nozzle (1) is descending to be contacted with the rod cell (5) and then ascending the original position to measure the height thereof. Further, in the JP’160, lasers are positioned above the substrate (2) to measure the height of the surface of the substrate (2). By the measurement of the height of the nozzle (1) and the height of the surface of the substrate (2), the nozzle (1) is moving above the substrate (2) in the uniform height from the surface of the substrate (2). That is, in JP’160, the nozzle (1) is aligned in the uniform height.

In contrary, in the claimed invention, the syringe dispenses the sealant onto the alignment plate to form the second alignment mark and the second alignment mark is taken a picture by the first image camera. The image of the second alignment mark is displayed in the display unit and

then compared with the reference position in the display unit to align the second alignment mark with the reference position by moving the table.

In other word, JP'160 fails to teach that the syringe dispenses the material onto the alignment plate and the image of the second alignment mark on the alignment plate is aligned with the reference position by moving the table. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 12 is allowable over the cited references.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claims 15-25 and reconsideration is respectfully requested. Claims 15-25 are allowable at least by virtue of the fact that they depend from claim 10, which is allowable. Since the rejected claims 13 and 14 are cancelled, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of claims 13 and 14.

Applicants believe the application is in condition for allowance and early, favorable action is respectfully solicited. If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. §1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911.

Dated: September 19, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By Valerie P. Hayes
Valerie P. Hayes
Registration No.: 53,005
McKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP
1900 K Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20006
(202) 496-7500
Attorneys for Applicant